BY ORDER OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE INSTRUCTION 14-202, VOLUME 2

31 MARCH 2015

Intelligence

INTELLIGENCE STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION PROGRAM

COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY

ACCESSIBILITY: Publications and forms are available on the e-Publishing website at www.e-publishing.af.mil.

RELEASABILITY: There are no releasability restrictions on this publication.

OPR: AF/A2DF

Certified by: AF/A2D
(Mr. Kenneth K. Dumm)

Pages: 29

Supersedes: AFI 14-202, Volume 2,
10 March 2008

This publication implements Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, and is consistent with AFI 14-202, Volume 1, *Intelligence Training*, and AFI 14-202, Volume 3, *General Intelligence Rules*, to establish qualification evaluation procedures for intelligence personnel and provide guidance on how to structure and manage a standardization/evaluation program. This publication applies to Regular Component, Air Force Reserve, Air National Guard (ANG), and Department of the Air Force (AF) Civilians, supporting AF operational missions at wing level and below. National Guard Bureau (NGB) will be considered functionally as a major command (MAJCOM) as appropriate for the purposes of this instruction. This publication requires the collection or maintenance of information protected by the Privacy Act of 1974. Privacy Act System of Records Notice F011 AF AFMC B, Patriot Excalibur, covers required information. The authority to maintain the records prescribed in this instruction are Title 10 U.S.C. 8013, *Secretary of the Air Force*; AFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System* and Executive Order 9397, *Numbering System for Federal Accounts Relating To Individual Persons*, as amended by Executive Order 13478, *Amendments to Executive Order 9397 Relating to Federal Agency Use of Social Security Numbers*.

Ensure all records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication are maintained in accordance with (IAW) Air Force Manual (AFMAN) 33-363, *Management of Records*, and disposed of IAW the Air Force Records Disposition Schedule located in the Air Force Records Information Management System. This publication may be supplemented, but all supplements are to be coordinated with the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) prior to certification and approval. Refer recommended changes to the OPR using the AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*. Route AF Forms 847 through the appropriate MAJCOM functional chain of command. The authorities to waive wing/unit-level requirements in this publication are identified with a Tier ("T-0, T-1, T-2, T-3") number following the compliance statement. See AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, for a description of the authorities associated with the Tier numbers. Submit requests for waivers through the chain of command to the appropriate Tier waiver approval authority or alternately to OPR for non-tiered compliance items.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This publication is substantially revised and must be completely reviewed. Significant revisions include: the addition of compliance waiver tiering per AFI 33-360; revised applicability with redefined roles and responsibilities; new guidelines for Senior Intelligence Officers (SIOs) of wings not covered by additional published guidance specific to their weapons system/mission set; common guidance rolled-up from subordinate AFI 14-2[MDS] volumes; clarification of terms and streamlined guidance, deletion of specific Standardization/Evaluation (Stan/Eval) Board requirement, and change to a 24-month evaluation cycle.

Chapter 1—INTRODUCTION 4
1.1. Purpose. 4
1.2. Publication Structure and Hierarchy. 4
1.3. Applicability. 4
1.4. Scope. 5
Chapter 2—ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 6
2.1. Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) (AF/A2). 6
2.2. Lead Command. 6
2.3. MAJCOM Directors of Intelligence (A2). 6
2.4. Unit Senior Intelligence Officer. 7
2.5. Unit Intelligence Stan/Eval program manager. 7
2.6. Intelligence Evaluator. 8
Chapter 3—UNIT INTELLIGENCE STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION PROGRAM 9
3.1. General. 9
3.2. Organization. 9
3.3. Intelligence evaluations. 9
3.4. Trend Analysis. 10
Chapter 4—EVALUATIONS 11

4.1. Evaluation Categories. 11
4.2. Timing of Qualification Evaluations. 12
4.3. Evaluation Criteria Source. 12
4.4. Grading System. 12
4.5. Failure to Pass an Evaluation. 14
4.6. Supervised Status. 15
4.7. Evaluation Timeline. 15
4.8. Evaluator Requirements. 15
Chapter 5—INTELLIGENCE EXAMINATIONS 16
5.1. Intelligence Examinations. 16
5.2. Master Question File (MQF). 16
5.3. Administrative Procedures. 16
Chapter 6—EVALUATION RECORDS 18
6.1. General. 18
6.2. Documentation. 18
6.3. Review of Qualification Evaluation Records. 18
6.4. Disposition of Qualification Evaluation Record. 18
6.5. Transfer of Evaluation Record. 18
Chapter 7—SPECIALIZED QUALIFICATIONS 20
7.1. IE Qualification. 20
Table 7.1. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Criteria. 20
7.2. External Intelligence Training (EIT) Trainer Evaluation. 20
Table 7.2. External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria. 21
Attachment 1—GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION 22
Attachment 2—AF FORM 4350, CERTIFICATE OF INTELLIGENCE QUALIFICATION 25

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Purpose. The objective of the AFI 14-202 series is to develop and maintain a high state of mission readiness for effective execution of AF missions supporting the full range of military operations. This is done by ensuring all personnel performing intelligence duties attain and maintain the qualifications and currencies needed to support their unit's mission effectively and to the minimum standards prescribed by each community.

1.2. Publication Structure and Hierarchy. AFPD 14-2 mandates an intelligence qualification training program, standardization/evaluation (Stan/Eval) program and prescribing of general intelligence procedures and policies.

1.2.1. AFI 14-202 prescribes the framework for unit intelligence programs and procedures. Specific guidance tailored to the mission set or mission design series (MDS), weapons system, intelligence function or activity is further detailed in applicable AFI 14-2 publications (hereafter referred to as "AFI 14-2[MDS]"). The AFI 14-202 publications take precedence over mission set instructions (AFI 14-2[MDS]).

1.2.2. The volume structure is consistent across the AFI series. AFI 14-202, Volume 1, *Intelligence Training*, structures the intelligence qualification training program with AFI 14-2[MDS] detailing specific knowledge and performance tasks as well as the currencies required for qualification within each mission set. AFI 14-202, Volume 2, *Intelligence Standardization/Evaluation Program*, structures the intelligence Stan/Eval program with AFI 14-2[MDS] defining specific evaluation standards and criteria for ensuring standardized qualifications within each mission set. AFI 14-202 Volume 3, *General Intelligence Rules* along with AFI 14-2[MDS], addresses the mission of each unit intelligence function, identify the key processes, tasks and procedures the unit requires in order to accomplish its mission. MAJCOMs will determine the applicability of these publications for mission sets not otherwise specifically addressed by published guidance.

1.3. Applicability.

1.3.1. The AFI 14-202 publications apply to those personnel who perform intelligence duties supporting AF operational missions at the wing level and below (as defined in AFI 38-101, *Air Force Organization*). These intelligence activities require clear guidance and oversight to ensure the proper allocation of AF resources to ensure the AF is ready to support Combatant Commander Objectives.

1.3.2. This publication is not intended to apply to functions such as command staff, technical training activities, service intelligence production centers, or acquisition support unless specifically directed by AFI 14-2[MDS] series publications. Nor is it intended to apply to mission sets already governed by other guidance such as non-14-series AFIs provided there is clear and sufficient guidance to effectively direct intelligence activities. Commanders of these units may choose to adopt the processes contained in AFI 14-202 for their personnel, but it is not required by this AFI series or AFPD 14-2. MAJCOMs/FOAs will determine the applicability of these publications for mission sets not otherwise specifically addressed by published guidance.

1.4. Scope. This volume describes execution of the intelligence Stan/Eval program specific to qualification in a duty position within a unit.

1.4.1. Additional guidance regarding Intelligence Community qualifications and certifications as directed by Department of Defense issuance may be further detailed in AFIs external to the 14-202/14-2[MDS] series, depending on the nature of the requirement. An example of this is AFI 14-126, *Target Coordinate Mensuration Training, Qualification and Certification Program*. Training and certification required by regulations such as these are supplemental to any duty position qualifications required by the AFI 14-202 and AFI14-2[MDS] series.

1.4.2. Certification of core tasks of a specialty training standard (STS) may be accomplished concurrently with intelligence evaluations if all requirements for both are met.

1.4.3. Qualifications versus Certifications. Qualifications are attained through evaluations and documented on the AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*. Certifications are attained through methods other than evaluation (e.g. SIO/commander certifications, designated certifier, etc.) and may be documented by a memorandum for record (MFR) signed by an authorized official.

Chapter 2

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1. Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) (AF/A2). AF/A2 delegates the following responsibilities to AF/A2DF. AF/A2DF will:

2.1.1. Develop policy guiding the conduct and execution of the Intelligence Stan/Eval Program.

2.1.2. Review and monitor AFI 14-2[MDS] volumes and MAJCOM intelligence Stan/Eval policies, guidance and supplements for consistency with AFI 14-202 and for standardization across intelligence mission sets.

2.1.3. Designate a lead command for each intelligence mission set.

2.1.4. Coordinate T-1 compliance waivers with lead commands to ensure awareness of Stan/Eval issues faced by other MAJCOMs in order to make informed programmatic decisions.

2.2. Lead Command. Lead commands are responsible for compiling requirements and ensuring consistency across the mission set. Lead commands will act in coordination with all affected MAJCOMs. Unresolved differences between MAJCOMs will be elevated to AF/A2DF for final resolution. The term “lead command” does not refer to a particular organizational echelon (i.e., may be a MAJCOM, Field Operating Agency (FOA), Center of Excellence, Bureau, etc.). In addition to their MAJCOM responsibilities, lead commands will:

2.2.1. Author and manage AFI 14-2[MDS] that defines Stan/Eval requirements for each mission set. AFI 14-2[MDS] may be more, but not less, restrictive than this publication.

2.2.2. Address Stan/Eval issues within each intelligence mission set community to ensure currency and applicability of Stan/Eval guidance. Sponsor unit-level 'best practices' exchanges to help address Stan/Eval issues (e.g. web sites).

2.2.3. Periodically review Intelligence Stan/Eval policies and procedures in coordination with affected MAJCOMs.

2.2.4. Review MAJCOM waivers to identify trends and determine any programmatic changes. Notify AF/A2DF if these trends indicate the need to readdress existing policy.

2.3. MAJCOM Directors of Intelligence (A2). The role of the MAJCOM Intelligence Stan/Eval function is to provide guidance, ensure units have lead command-validated materials as well as any standardized MAJCOM materials needed, and assist units in conducting their Stan/Eval programs. NGB/A2 has these responsibilities and is included as part of the general title MAJCOM for this publication. The MAJCOM Intelligence Stan/Eval function will:

2.3.1. Designate an OPR for the administration of the MAJCOM’s Intelligence Stan/Eval function. The OPR should remain within the intelligence directorate and can be executed by one or more designated staff offices/divisions. The OPR ideally should be manned by experienced Intelligence Evaluators (IE). There is no requirement for personnel to gain/maintain evaluator qualification and currency nor to have manning with IE experience in every MDS within the MAJCOM.

2.3.2. Coordinate with lead commands to establish and maintain standardized minimum Stan/Eval requirements and supporting Stan/Eval materials necessary to meet expected unit requirements.

2.3.3. Provide guidance for units without published AFI 14-2[MDS] series to develop local Stan/Eval program consistent with the AFI 14-202 framework.

2.3.4. Analyze staff assistance visit, inspector general reports, unit trend analysis reports, and other unit metrics to identify trends and problem areas. Correct deficiencies as required, and report status of unit Stan/Eval programs to lead command, as requested.

2.3.5. Track subordinate unit waiver requests and coordinate with lead commands to allow programmatic adjustments.

2.4. Unit Senior Intelligence Officer. The SIO is defined as the Airman responsible for intelligence functions and operations within an organization. Unless otherwise directed by the Wing Commander, this is the highest-ranking AF Airman within the organization that has: 1) been awarded an AF intelligence Specialty Code or civilian occupational series and 2) is serving in an AF intelligence position. This position is synonymous with the Chief of Wing Intelligence (CWI), where applicable. Installations with intelligence activities in different chains of command have separate SIOs, each responsible for the intelligence functions and operations (or activities) of their units, accountable to their commander and inspectable by their respective MAJCOM Inspector General. The unit SIO will:

2.4.1. Establish and maintain a Stan/Eval program. If no AFI14-2[MDS] exists, develop a local Stan/Eval program consistent with the AFI 14-202 framework and capture in local written guidance. **(T-1)**

2.4.2. Ensure intelligence evaluations and examinations are conducted and managed using the evaluation criteria in the applicable AFI 14-2[MDS]. **(T-1)**

2.4.3. Ensure evaluation records are completed. **(T-1)**

2.4.4. Ensure trends are identified, tracked, and corrective actions applied. **(T-2)**

2.4.5. Ensure the review of evaluation records for newly-assigned intelligence personnel to determine evaluations required. **(T-2)**

2.5. Unit Intelligence Stan/Eval program manager. The Unit Intelligence Stan/Eval program manager will:

2.5.1. Develop procedures for the conduct and management of intelligence evaluations and examinations. **(T-1)**

2.5.2. Manage documentation of qualification evaluation records. **(T-1)**

2.5.3. Identify, track, and apply corrective actions to trends. For units/organizations with more than one type of aircraft/mission, combine common discrepancies to address trends. **(T-2)**

2.5.4. Ensure evaluation records are forwarded to gaining unit when individuals Permanent Change of Station /Assignment (PCS/PCA) to assist gaining unit in assessing qualifications and determining training requirements. (T-1)

2.6. Intelligence Evaluator. The IE will conduct evaluations as required, using the evaluation criteria in the applicable AFI 14-2[MDS] and support unit Intelligence Stan/Eval functions as outlined in Chapter 3 of this publication. **(T-1)**

Chapter 3

UNIT INTELLIGENCE STANDARDIZATION/EVALUATION PROGRAM

3.1. General. Intelligence Stan/Eval ensures personnel performing intelligence functions can perform their duties to minimum acceptable standards by observing them in performance of those duties. The Stan/Eval program also provides honest feedback to enable personnel to improve their individual performance. Stan/Eval provides feedback into training programs since trends observed among several individuals can highlight deficiencies in training. It also ensures personnel do not put themselves or others at risk by performing duties for which they are not qualified. More specifically, the Stan/Eval program:

3.1.1. Ensures standardization of procedures for intelligence operations.

3.1.2. Ensures compliance with appropriate operational, training and administrative directives.

3.1.3. Provides a system to assess and document individual proficiency and capability to accomplish assigned intelligence duties.

3.1.4. Recognizes trends in training and performance in order to identify improvement areas in training programs, standard operating procedures, and directives.

3.2. Organization. The composition of the unit Stan/Eval function is at the SIO's discretion with the following considerations:

3.2.1. The unit intelligence Stan/Eval program manager will be a qualified and current IE. **(T-1)**

3.2.2. The number of IEs should be proportionate to the organization's scope and number of assigned personnel.

3.2.3. In a multi-MDS wing/unit, not all Stan/Eval personnel are required to be qualified in every MDS provided each MDS is represented by at least one qualified individual. **(T-2)**

3.2.4. Personnel may perform Stan/Eval duties full-time, as an additional duty, or mixture of both as appropriate to meet mission needs.

3.3. Intelligence evaluations. The following applies to the conduct of all unit intelligence mission qualification and specialized training evaluations.

3.3.1. Evaluation Cycle. Periodic evaluations will be conducted on a 24-month cycle (or more frequently as mandated by applicable AFI 14-2[MDS]). **(T-1)** For a standard evaluation cycle, evaluations expire on the last day of the 24th month after which the evaluation was successfully completed. The individual enters the evaluation eligibility window 18 months after the previous evaluation (6-month period prior to expiration date). Extensions may be granted by the SIO.

3.3.2. Evaluations should be accomplished in a realistic training environment in conjunction with in-garrison events to the maximum extent possible. Evaluations during exercises are encouraged. Units should apply operational risk management principles to determine whether it is appropriate to conduct an evaluation during real-world operations.

3.3.3. Grading instructions. IEs will be thoroughly familiar with and will use the prescribed evaluation criteria IAW AFI 14-2[MDS] to assign an appropriate evaluation grade for each area or sub-area IAW with the documentation instructions in this publication. **(T-1)** Based on a composite of these individual area/sub-area grades, the IE determines the overall qualification level.

3.3.4. IEs will conduct thorough pre-event preparation and post-event debriefing with the examinee to provide feedback that allows the individual to improve performance. **(T-3)** The IE will also prepare participants (e.g. aircrew role-playing a debrief or other intelligence crew positions providing information to the examinee) to ensure objectives of the evaluation are met. **(T-3)**

3.3.5. IEs should promptly notify the examinee's supervisor whenever unsatisfactory performance is observed.

3.3.6. The person responsible for the majority of an individual's qualification training should not perform the initial qualification evaluation for that same individual unless manning constraints make this impossible. If this occurs, the SIO will document the necessity of this in the individual's qualification record. **(T-3)** Recurring evaluations may be performed by any qualified IE.

3.4. Trend Analysis. Stan/Eval trend analysis aids the SIO in reviewing and resolving issues for the unit as well as subordinate and attached units, as applicable. Additionally, data compiled across multiple units allows MAJCOMs to determine any systemic problem areas or programmatic issues.

3.4.1. Trend analysis data should include unit evaluation and examination results, waivers and extensions, trends and status, Stan/Eval manning issues and other requirements as identified by MAJCOMs.

3.4.2. Trend reporting will be conducted at least annually but frequency and timing may be determined by MAJCOM data calls or reporting requirements. **(T-2)**

Chapter 4

EVALUATIONS

4.1. Evaluation Categories. Intelligence qualification evaluations are divided into three categories, each typically consisting of two structured phases (knowledge and task) requiring the completion of requisite events. The knowledge phase includes a series of written (and/or oral, if applicable) examinations. The task phase includes a hands-on evaluation of intelligence task performance.

4.1.1. Mission (MSN) Evaluations. MSN evaluations ensure the individual's ability to support full mission planning and employment in accomplishing the unit's operational mission. All intelligence personnel assigned to a position maintaining Combat Mission Ready (CMR) or Basic Mission Capable (BMC) status (IAW AFI 14-202, Volume 1) will complete an initial MSN evaluation (INIT MSN) and periodic MSN evaluations as specified in the applicable AFI 14-2[MDS]. **(T-1)**

4.1.2. Specialized Qualification Evaluations. All intelligence personnel maintaining specialized qualifications must complete initial and periodic evaluations of their specialized qualifications at least every 24 months or more frequently if directed in their respective AFI 14-2[MDS]. **(T-1)**

4.1.3. SPOT Evaluations. A SPOT evaluation is used to evaluate a specific event or requirement without intending to satisfy the requirements of a complete periodic evaluation. SPOT evaluations are optional and have no specific requisites or requirements, unless specified in supplementary guidance. SPOT evaluations may consist of a knowledge and/or task phase.

4.1.4. Intelligence Evaluation Prefixes. The following prefixes are used, as applicable:

4.1.4.1. Initial (INIT) Prefix. The first evaluation of any type for a position or specialized qualification is assigned the "INIT" prefix (e.g., INIT MSN, INIT EIT).

4.1.4.2. Requalification (RQ) Prefix. An evaluation administered to requalify due to an expired evaluation, loss of currency exceeding 6 months, a failed periodic evaluation, or loss of qualification due to SIO-directed downgrade. Document the AF Form 4350 Event Check description with an RQ prefix.

4.1.4.2.1. When loss of qualification is due to expiration of a required periodic evaluation, the evaluation given will be IAW the guidance for that periodic evaluation. **(T-1)**

4.1.4.2.2. When loss of qualification is due to loss of currency, the evaluation profile will be as directed by the SIO and will include, as a minimum, those items for which the individual is non-current for over 6 months. **(T-2)**

4.1.4.2.3. If loss of qualification is due to failure to pass an evaluation, only use RQ prefix on evaluations other than initial (INIT) evaluation. If an INIT evaluation, no qualification was previously achieved, thus requalification is not possible.

4.1.4.2.4. When loss of qualification is due to an SIO-directed downgrade, the SIO determines the appropriate evaluation profile.

4.1.4.3. No-Notice (N/N) Prefix. An evaluation is considered N/N when the examinee is notified of the evaluation only once normal preparation for an event has begun. The evaluator determines the beginning of the preparation period; this may be defined further by the unit.

4.1.4.3.1. A small percentage of evaluations should be given out-of-cycle and without the opportunity for the examinee to perform any extraordinary preparation. The N/N evaluation program provides SIOs and supervisors a tool to assess the actual mission readiness of their personnel and assess unit training effectiveness.

4.1.4.3.2. If an examinee successfully completes an N/N evaluation that covers all requirements of a normal periodic evaluation (e.g. N/N MSN), the examinee's next periodic evaluation due date should be updated so the next evaluation will not be due until 24 months after the N/N evaluation unless specified sooner in AFI 14-2[MDS].

4.1.5. Combined Evaluations. To promote efficient use of resources, evaluations may be combined. Include the designation of each evaluation on the AF Form 4350 - e.g., MSN/EIT. The applicability of any prefixes to portions of any combined evaluations should be explained under Task Description in the Evaluator's Remarks.

4.2. Timing of Qualification Evaluations.

4.2.1. Expiration Date. Required periodic evaluations expire on the last day of the 24th month after the evaluation was successfully completed. Lead commands may require periodic evaluations more frequently than 24 months as directed in the applicable AFI 14-2[MDS].

4.2.2. Scheduling. Schedule periodic evaluations in the eligibility period (6-month period prior to expiration date).

4.2.3. SIO-Extended Evaluations. SIOs may extend the expiration date of periodic evaluations up to 3 months for the reasons listed below. Document such extensions with a Memo for Record placed in the individual's evaluation record.

4.2.3.1. Extended Temporary Duty (TDY) over 90 days such as a deployment which precludes performing the evaluation during the normal 6-month eligibility window.

4.2.3.2. Individual departing PCS/PCA, separating, or retiring from the service.

4.2.4. Transfers. Upon PCS to a like mission set, individuals qualified in a crew position may retain current qualifications provided requirements in AFI 14-202, Volume 1, are met.

4.3. Evaluation Criteria Source. Each AFI 14-2[MDS] establishes standardized evaluation criteria. In the absence of an AFI 14-2[MDS] series, the SIO will ensure local guidance is established for evaluation criteria. **(T-2)**

4.4. Grading System. The grading system used to evaluate and document performance consists of two distinct parts: individual area/subarea grades and overall qualification levels.

4.4.1. Area/Subarea Grades. Areas to be evaluated are identified as gradesheet elements in the AFI14-2[MDS] for documentation on the AF4381. The grading criteria is defined in the AFI 14-2[MDS].

4.4.1.1. Certain areas or subareas may be designated “critical areas” because failure to follow the strict requirements of instructions, regulations, or procedures could cause mission failure or injury. Critical areas, if applicable, are noted in the AFI 14-2[MDS].

4.4.1.2. Individual areas are graded with a 3-level system (Q, Q- or U), except for critical areas which are pass/fail (Q or U) only.

4.4.1.2.1. Qualified (Q). Q is the desired level of performance. The examinee demonstrated a satisfactory knowledge of all required information, performed intelligence duties within the prescribed tolerances and accomplished the assigned mission.

4.4.1.2.2. Qualified with discrepancies (Q-). Q- indicates the examinee is qualified to perform the assigned area tasks, but requires debriefing or additional training as determined by the evaluator.

4.4.1.2.3. Unqualified (U). Assign a U area grade for any performance outside allowable parameters or deviations from prescribed procedures/tolerances that adversely affected mission accomplishment or compromised safety/security. An examinee receiving an area grade of U normally requires additional training. However, if the evaluator is able to correct the issue with verbal feedback and believes the examinee will be able to perform acceptably in their next evaluation, additional training may not be required.

4.4.1.3. The overall area grade (Q/Q-/U) cannot be higher than the lowest of any subarea grade awarded.

4.4.2. Overall Qualification Levels. Qualification levels are represented by a three-tiered system (Q1, Q2, Q3). The overall qualification level awarded is based on performance during both the knowledge and task phases. Qualification level is determined as a cumulative score based on the area/subarea grades. The evaluator administering the majority of the evaluation is responsible for deciding the overall qualification grade and annotating the AF4350.

4.4.2.1. Qualification Level 1 (Q1). The member demonstrated desired performance and knowledge of procedures, equipment and directives within tolerances specified in the grading criteria. This is awarded when no discrepancies were noted and may be awarded when discrepancies are noted if: the discrepancies resulted in no U grades being given in any area(s)/subarea(s); in the judgment of the evaluator, none of the discrepancies preclude awarding an overall Q1; and all discrepancies noted during the evaluation were cleared during the debrief of that evaluation.

4.4.2.2. Qualification Level 2 (Q2). The member demonstrated the ability to perform duties, but: there were one or more area(s)/subarea(s) where additional training was assigned; or a non-critical area(s)/subarea(s) grade of U was awarded; or in the judgment of the evaluator, there is justification based on performance in one or several areas/subareas.

4.4.2.3. Qualification Level 3 (Q3). The member demonstrated an unacceptable level of safety, security, performance, or knowledge. An overall Q3 can be awarded if, in the judgment of the evaluator, there is justification based on performance in one or several areas/subareas. An area grade of U awarded in a critical area requires an overall Q3 for the evaluation. An overall grade of Q3 can be awarded at any time during the evaluation but completing the evaluation may allow assessment of other areas which may need additional training.

4.4.3. Remedial Action. All grades of Q- or less require action to remedy the discrepancy. Remedial action includes debriefing the discrepancies, and/or assignment of additional training, and/or imposing of restrictions.

4.4.3.1. Debriefed Discrepancy**.** Remedial action accomplished during debrief of the evaluation wherein the evaluator provides briefing/instruction concerning the discrepancy and determines that the examinee has gained the necessary knowledge or proficiency to remedy the discrepancy. The discrepancy area/subarea description is annotated with "Debriefed" in paragraph B of the Evaluator's Remarks section of the AF Form 4350 comments (see Attachment 2).

4.4.3.2. Additional Training. Any training recommended by an evaluator to remedy deficiencies identified during an evaluation. Additional training:

4.4.3.2.1. May include self-study, instruction, use of a computer based training program or an event. Once additional training is complete, the examinee must demonstrate satisfactory knowledge or proficiency. **(T-2)**

4.4.3.2.2. Will be completed within 30 days or two Unit Training Assemblies (UTAs) for Air Force Reserve (AFR) and ANG. For reevaluations, adjust the expiration date of the current qualification to allow for remedial training. **(T-2)**

4.4.3.2.3. Should be documented in the AF Form 4350 comments under paragraph C, Recommended Additional Training, under Evaluator's Remarks. Include a description of how satisfactory knowledge or proficiency is to be demonstrated to an evaluator, supervisor or instructor. Due dates and completion dates for additional training are documented in the appropriate areas of the AF Form 4350 (see Attachment 2).

4.5. Failure to Pass an Evaluation.

4.5.1. Recheck Evaluation. If an individual fails an evaluation, a recheck evaluation must be completed no later than 60 days after the evaluation was conducted (or four UTAs for AFR and ANG). **(T-2)** SIOs may approve waivers to the time limits up to an additional 30 days (or one additional UTA for AFR/ANG) on a case-by-case basis. Document such action with an MFR.

4.5.2. Status Downgrade. Downgrade members receiving a Q-3 on a MSN evaluation to non-CMR (N-CMR) or non-BMC (N-BMC), as applicable. For specialized qualification evaluations, the status (i.e., CMR or BMC) does not need to be downgraded if the discrepancies were only in specialized qualification areas.

4.5.3. Restrictions. When called for by this publication or deemed necessary in the judgment of the evaluator and/or supervisor, the examinee will not perform applicable duties while unsupervised until successful completion of assigned additional training and/or a recheck. **(T-2)**

4.5.3.1. Document restrictions on the AF Form 4350 and address the specific task or event that requires supervision until successful retraining is completed. Restrictions are not punitive, but designed to enhance performance and proficiency.

4.5.3.2. Restrict individuals receiving a Q-3 on an evaluation, as listed below, until a successful recheck evaluation is completed.

4.5.3.2.1. MSN Evaluation. The examinee may perform basic qualification tasks unless specifically restricted. Place the examinee on supervised status for mission tasks.

4.5.3.2.2. Specialized Qualification Evaluation. Examinees receiving an unsatisfactory grade in any specialized area(s) will not perform specialized duties until a successful recheck is complete. **(T-2)**

4.6. Supervised Status. If unsatisfactory performance requires the member to be placed on supervised status, the SIO determines the type of supervision.

4.7. Evaluation Timeline. Some evaluations may be relatively simple and can be finished in a matter of hours. Others are more complex and may require multiple sessions to evaluate all required items. Evaluations should last no more than 5 duty days.

4.8. Evaluator Requirements. Evaluators will be qualified and current in the mission set and crew position they evaluate. **(T-2)** However, when this is not feasible, an evaluator from a similar MDS or crew position may perform an evaluation. If determined acceptable by the lead command.

Chapter 5

INTELLIGENCE EXAMINATIONS

5.1. Intelligence Examinations. Intelligence examinations measure an individual's knowledge of procedures, threats and other information essential for effective intelligence operations. Knowledge requisites for periodic intelligence qualification evaluations includes a series of examinations as listed in the applicable AFI 14-2[MDS]. Poor testing performance on examinations can often indicate areas requiring increased training emphasis.

5.2. Master Question File (MQF). The MQF is a set of applicable questions designed to meet the needs of various unit-level intelligence examinations. Lead commands are responsible for ensuring that an applicable MQF is produced to support each mission set and that the MQF and related source materials are accessible to all examinees.

5.3. Administrative Procedures. Units will develop unit specific examination policies and procedures. **(T-2)**

5.3.1. Intelligence Stan/Eval functions will develop and maintain positive control of all examination materials (i.e. tests, answer sheets, and associated electronic media). **(T-2)**

5.3.2. Unit Intelligence Stan/Eval will maintain a minimum of two tests on file for each mission set/crew position and ensure that no more than 50% of the questions are duplicated between tests. **(T-2)**

5.3.3. Units using computer-generated examinations do not need to maintain the examinations referenced above provided the following restrictions are observed:

5.3.3.1. Individual examinations are randomly generated from the MQF.

5.3.3.2. Re-examinations are constructed so that duplication of questions is kept to a minimum.

5.3.4. Change 50 percent of the questions on the requisite examinations every calendar year.

5.3.5. Grade examinations as a percentage of correct answers.

5.3.6. Retention of Examination Records. Retain graded exam answer sheets/computer records until the AF Form 4350 is completed and signed by member.

5.3.7. Examination Question Review. Stan/Eval should review all MQFs and prepared exams for accuracy annually and after any changes in source documents.

5.3.8. Grading Policy. Minimum Passing Grade. The minimum passing grade for examinations is 85 percent, unless otherwise noted in applicable AFI 14-2[MDS].

5.3.9. Failure to Pass. An evaluation is not complete until all required exams have been passed.

5.3.9.1. Reexamination Policy. An individual failing a required exam should be afforded an adequate study period prior to reexamination. Test the individual using an alternate exam.

5.3.9.2. Reexamination Period. Individuals who fail a required test must complete a reexamination within 30 days (AFR/ANG: Four UTAs) following the date of the failure.

(T-2) Waiver authority to extend the time allowed to successfully complete the examination is the SIO. Document such waivers with a Memo for Record placed in the qualification evaluation record of the individual.

5.3.9.3. Supervised Status Requirement. Stan/Eval will place individuals who fail a requisite knowledge examination in supervised status until successful retesting is completed and notify the individual’s supervisor and the SIO of this action. **(T-2)** For individuals who maintain multiple qualifications, supervised status resulting from failure of a knowledge type examination applies only to the MDS, weapons system, function or activity for which the examination was administered.

5.3.10. If an individual is qualified in more than one duty position or holds a specialized qualification in addition to a baseline qualification and both qualifications require the same test, there is no requirement to take the test more than once provided the test is taken in the eligibility period for both qualifications.

Chapter 6

EVALUATION RECORDS

6.1. General. Evaluation results are recorded and verify that an individual is qualified for his or her duty position. In addition to the record of individual evaluation results, a chronological history of evaluations is also recorded to have a summary report of qualifications of the individual. Evaluation records are to be maintained throughout an individual's service and transfer with the individual to each assignment. All intelligence personnel supporting the operational mission of the unit/organization are to have an evaluation record, which includes all AF Forms 4350, applicable MFR, and additional lead command/MAJCOM specified items.

6.2. Documentation.

6.2.1. *Intelligence Gradesheet* (AF Form 4381). The IE will use a hardcopy AF Form 4381 containing the MDS-specific task elements from the gradesheet attachment in AFI 14-2[MDS] to assist in grading the individual areas during the evaluation and taking notes to ensure all required areas are evaluated. **(T-2)** Do not use the gradesheet completed on the individual during MQT/ST. After documenting any discrepancies noted during the evaluation on the AF Form 4350, the IE may destroy the hardcopy AF Forms 4381 used during the evaluation. Do not destroy AF Forms 4381 completed during qualification or specialized training. An electronically-derived evaluation gradesheet may be used in lieu of the actual AF Form 4381.

6.2.2. *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification* (AF Form 4350). The overall evaluation result is recorded on the AF Form 4350 which becomes the source document to verify that an individual is qualified for his or her duty position. Any applicable MFRs should be maintained along with the AF Form 4350s. As source documents, AF Forms 4350 may be corrected provided the IE who signed the AF Form 4350 verifies the change.

6.2.3. *Record of Intelligence Evaluation* (AF Form 4349). An individual's chronological history of evaluations is recorded on the AF Form 4349. A complete history of the AF Forms 4350 in a member's record is maintained on their AF Form 4349. AF Forms 4349, not being source documents, may be altered without restriction to reflect the assignment of the affected member and the contents of AF Form 4350 Section.

6.2.4. On-line Documentation. Documentation will be IAW AF/A2 approved processes. **(T-2)**

6.3. Review of Qualification Evaluation Records. The unit will review the records for all newly assigned intelligence personnel to identify previous training and qualifications. **(T-2)** The reviewing organization is responsible for establishing the currency and qualification of the intelligence specialist as determined from the latest applicable documentation. Following determination of the currency and qualification of the intelligence specialist, the unit maintaining the record is responsible only for documentation subsequently placed in the record.

6.4. Disposition of Qualification Evaluation Record. Outdated material and miscellaneous documentation identified during reviews is to be returned to the member for disposal.

6.5. Transfer of Evaluation Record. When custody of the record is transferred to a new unit or base, the losing unit is to ensure the record is successfully transferred to the gaining unit either electronically or in hardcopy as required. For personnel going into inactive status or not serving with an AF intelligence operational mission, the losing unit surrenders the qualification record to the individual to maintain.

Chapter 7

SPECIALIZED QUALIFICATIONS

7.1. IE Qualification. An individual is considered qualified to perform IE duties upon completion of the IE ST profiles, successful IE evaluation, and endorsement by the SIO.

7.1.1. IE Evaluation.

7.1.1.1. The examinee will perform an observed evaluation, demonstrating proficiency in incorporating objectives of the evaluation, applying evaluation criteria, grading, and preparing evaluation forms. **(T-1)** Evaluation criteria is defined in Table 7.1.

Table 7.1. Intelligence Evaluator Evaluation Criteria.

Q	Demonstrated ability to evaluate effectively. Planned evaluation efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated all objectives. Displayed thorough knowledge of evaluation criteria, grading procedures and evaluation documentation preparation. Completed appropriate evaluation records accurately. Adequately assessed and recorded performance. Comments were clear and pertinent. Correct classification and security markings on all products.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge regarding unit procedures, evaluation requirements, or documentation. Minor problems in communicating or organization of evaluation. Did not adversely affect the evaluation. Minor errors or omissions in evaluation records. Comments were incomplete or slightly unclear.
U	Inability to effectively communicate evaluation procedures to the examinee. Did not plan evaluation efficiently and/or made poor decisions that adversely affected the evaluation process. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from evaluator effectiveness. Did not complete required forms or records. Comments were invalid, unclear, or did not accurately document performance. Incorrect classification/security markings.

7.1.1.2. An IE receiving a grade of “U” in any grading area must not perform IE duties until completing additional training and a successful evaluation. **(T-2)** This restriction is placed in the Comments section and “yes” is marked in restrictions on the AF Form 4350. An area grade of “U” in any grading area results in an overall Q-3 for the IE evaluation. Evaluation grading is covered in Chapter 5.

7.1.2. IE Currency. In order to maintain qualification, IEs must conduct at least one evaluation annually to remain current and be evaluated via periodic IE evaluations at least every 24 months. **(T-1)**

7.2. External Intelligence Training (EIT) Trainer Evaluation. Mission sets requiring qualified EITs will evaluate their EITs according to a common standard of instructional ability. **(T-2)**

7.2.1. EIT evaluations consist of a knowledge examination and a performance task evaluation. Upon completion of EIT training profiles outlined in AFI 14-202, Volume 1 and any additional profiles specific to the mission set as detailed in AFI 14-2[MDS], the EIT trainer will demonstrate knowledge of the information presented by successfully completing a test based on the questions from the MQF (85 percent minimum to pass), as applicable. **(T-2)** Evaluation will also gauge the EIT trainer's ability to present training in each applicable profile.

7.2.2. EIT evaluations may be conducted in conjunction with a MSN evaluation.

7.2.3. EIT Evaluation Criteria. All EITs will be evaluated to at least the following criteria. **(T-1)** Additional criteria may be defined in the applicable AFI 14-2[MDS].

Table 7.2. External Intelligence Training Trainer Evaluation Criteria.

INSTRUCTIONAL ABILITY - GENERAL	
Q	Demonstrated ability to instruct effectively. Planned training efficiently and made timely decisions, incorporated and met all objectives. Effectively fielded and accurately answered questions from audience. Demonstrated subject matter knowledge. Able to quickly retrieve answers/amplifying data from reference materials. Correct classification and security markings on all products produced.
Q-	Deficiencies in depth of knowledge, comprehension of unit procedures, requirements, mission or threats. Minor problems in communicating or organization of instruction. Did not adversely affect training.
U	Inability to effectively communicate instruction to the audience. Did not plan training efficiently. Made poor decisions that adversely affected training. Unfamiliar with procedures, requirements, mission, or threats. Lack of knowledge in certain areas seriously detracted from instructor effectiveness. Incorrect classification.

ROBERT P. OTTO, Lieutenant General, USAF
Deputy Chief of Staff, Intelligence,
Surveillance and Reconnaissance

Attachment 1

GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

References

AFPD 14-2, *Intelligence Rules and Procedures*, 29 November 2007

AFI 14-126, *Target Coordinate Mensuration Training, Qualification and Certification Program*, 14 March 2013.

AFI 14-202, Volume 1, *Intelligence Training*, 31 March 2015

AFI 14-202, Volume 3, *General Intelligence Rules*, 10 March 2008

AFI 33-360, *Publications and Forms Management*, 25 September 2013

AFI 36-2201, Air Force Training Program15 September 2010

AFI 36-2608, *Military Personnel Records System*, 30 August 2006

AFI 38-101, *Air Force Organization*, 16 March 2011

AFMAN 33-363, *Management of Records,* 1 March 2008

Prescribed Forms

AF Form 4349, *Record of Intelligence Evaluation*, 10 March 2008

AF Form 4350, *Certificate of Intelligence Qualification*, 10 March 2008

Adopted Forms

AF Form 847, *Recommendation for Change of Publication*, 22 September 2009

AF Form 4381, *Intelligence Gradesheet*, 10 March 2008

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AF—Air Force

AFI—Air Force Instruction

AFMAN—Air Force Manual

AFPD—Air Force Policy Directive

AFR—Air Force Reserve

AFRC—Air Force Reserve Command

ANG—Air National Guard

A2—Directorates of Intelligence

BMC—Basic Mission Capable

CMR—Combat Mission Ready

EIT—External Intelligence Trainer

EPR—Enlisted Performance Report

FOA—Field Operating Agency

HHQ—Higher Headquarters

IAW—In Accordance With

IE—Intelligence Evaluator

INIT—Initial Evaluation

ISR—Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance

MAJCOM—Major Command

MDS—Mission Design Series

MFR—Memorandum for Record

MQF—Master Question File

MSN—Mission Qualification Evaluation

N/A—Not Applicable

N/N—No-Notice

N-BMC—Non-Basic Mission Capable

N-CMR—Non-Combat Mission Ready

NGB—National Guard Bureau

OPR—Office of Primary Responsibility; Officer Performance Report

PCA—Permanent Change of Assignment

PCS—Permanent Change of Station

Q—Qualified

Q-—Qualified with Discrepancies

RQ—Requalification Evaluation

SIO—Senior Intelligence Officer

Stan/Eval—Standardization/Evaluation

STS—Specialty Training Standard

T-0—Tier 0

T-1—Tier 1

T-2—Tier 2

T-3—Tier 3

TDY—Temporary Duty

UTA—Unit Training Assembly

U—Unqualified

Terms

Mission Set—Broad term encompassing Mission Design Series (MDS), weapons system, and intelligence activity/function, providing a single term to refer to disparate unit-level intelligence activities, and further defined, as appropriate, by MAJCOM guidance

Tier 0 (T-0)—Requirement external to AF; determined by respective non-AF authority (e.g. Congress, White House, OSD, JS). Requests for waivers must be processed through command channels to publication OPR for consideration**.**

Tier 1 (T-1)—Non-compliance puts Airmen, commanders, or the USAF strongly at risk of mission or program failure, death, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the MAJCOM/CC level, with the concurrence of the publication's Approving Official.

Tier 2 (T-2)—Non-compliance may degrade mission or program effectiveness or efficiency and has potential to create moderate risk of mission or program failure, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the MAJCOM/CC level, but may not be delegated lower than MAJCOM Director.

Tier 3 (T-3)—Non-compliance may limit mission or program effectiveness or efficiency and has a relatively remote potential to create risk of mission or program degradation or failure, injury, legal jeopardy or unacceptable fraud, waste or abuse. Waivers may be granted at the Wing/DRU/FOA/CC level (delegable no lower than Group/CC or equivalent).

Attachment 2

AF FORM 4350, CERTIFICATE OF INTELLIGENCE QUALIFICATION

A2.1. Purpose. Use the AF Form 4350 to record and to certify intelligence qualification as demonstrated in required evaluations.

A2.2. General Data Entry. Use the following guidance when completing an AF Form 4350.

A2.3. Date Completed. Use the latest completion date (knowledge or task phase) of the evaluation requisites or additional training.

A2.4. - Examinee Information.

A2.4.1. Name, Grade and if applicable, member unique identification number.

A2.4.2. Organization and Location. Use the unit designation and location where the examinee is assigned or attached.

A2.4.3. Duty Position. Enter the MDS/specialty in which the evaluation was given (e.g. F-16).

A2.4.4. Eligibility Period.

A2.4.4.1. Enter the type of evaluation with the 6-month period preceding the expiration date from the last similar evaluation (e.g., if the last MSN evaluation expires Sep 15, enter MSN: Apr-Sep 15). For personnel with specialized training evaluation requirements list all eligibility periods as applicable (e.g., if the MSN evaluation expires Sep 15 and the EIT evaluation expires Dec 15, enter MSN: Apr-Sep 15/EIT: Jul-Dec 15).

A2.4.4.2. For initial periodic evaluations, periodic evaluations accomplished outside the examinee's normal eligibility period and SPOT evaluations, enter N/A (not applicable).

A2.5. - Qualification.

A2.5.1. Knowledge Phase.

A2.5.1.1. Examination/Check. Make a separate entry for each knowledge requisite (e.g., Open Book, Closed Book, Visual Recognition Test).

A2.5.1.2. Date. In the date column, enter the date that the requisite is successfully completed.

A2.5.1.3. Grade. Enter score; if initial test resulted in a failing grade, enter failed examination score with successfully completed score as follows: 84/98.

A2.5.2. Task Phase.

A2.5.2.1. Event/Check.

A2.5.2.1.1. Use the following designators to describe the purpose of the evaluation(s): MSN, Specialized Training Evaluation (e.g., EIT, IE), and SPOT.

A2.5.2.1.2. Use the following prefixes, when applicable, to describe the type of evaluation: INIT, RQ and N/N.

A2.5.2.1.3. Make a single line entry to document the task(s) used to complete the evaluation.

A2.5.2.2. Date. Enter the date the task was completed.

A2.5.3. Qualification Level.

A2.5.3.1. Place a “1” or “2” in the qualified block or a “3” in the unqualified block for the individual’s overall qualification level.

A2.5.3.2. Combined evaluations (e.g., EIT/MSN) require only one qualification level number if all parts of the evaluation were awarded the same qualification level grade.

A2.5.3.3. If the qualification levels assigned to parts of a combined evaluation vary, indicate the qualification level for each party separately (e.g., “EIT: 1” and “MSN: 2”) in the qualified block.

A2.5.4. Expiration Date of Qualification.

A2.5.4.1. For an evaluation that establish a new eligibility period, enter the month and year that is 24 months after the task phase of the evaluation was successfully completed.

A2.5.4.2. For an evaluation that does not establish a new eligibility period, enter “N/A.”

A2.5.5. Restrictions. Place an “X” in the applicable block and list specific restrictions as the first item in the comments block.

A2.5.6. Additional Training Due Date(s).

A2.5.6.1. If required, enter a due date that accommodates the additional training timeline IAW paragraph 4.4.3.2.2 of this instruction; otherwise, enter “N/A.”

A2.5.6.2. If more than one date is required, preface the due dates as appropriate.

A2.5.7. Date Additional Training Completed.

A2.5.7.1. Enter the date(s) the examinee completed additional training, otherwise, enter “N/A.”

A2.5.7.2. If more than one date is required, preface the date completed as appropriate.

A2.5.7.3. The final approving officer signing Section III of the AF Form 4350 is responsible for certifying additional training was complete.

A2.5.7.4. The trainer (or other designated individual) completing the additional training (or last training event if more than one) signs and dates the Additional Training block in Section II of the AF Form 4350.

A2.5.8. Comments. Include the following headings and format in the space provided. See Table A2.1.

Table A2.1. Example Format of Comments AF Form 4350.

COMMENTS (If more space is needed, continue on reverse)
EXCEPTIONALLY QUALIFIED (if applicable). If awarded, comments documenting justification of exceptionally qualified designation by the IE are mandatory. Restriction(s): Required for less than qualified evaluation performance.

Evaluator's Remarks:
A. Evaluation Descriptions
1. Knowledge Description. Knowledge descriptions may list the examinations accomplished with the corresponding percent of questions answered correctly.
2. Task Description. Task descriptions should be of sufficient detail to verify that the significant required areas for the evaluations were accomplished.
B. Discrepancies- (Document all discrepancies of Q- or U)
1. Knowledge.
2. Task.
Use the following entries if appropriate:
C. Recommended Additional Training.
1. Knowledge.
2. Task.
D. Additional Comments. Comments in this section are restricted to significant information dealing with the evaluation not documented elsewhere. OPR/EPR type comments, or comments comparing the examinee to other individuals are prohibited.
If an individual received an overall Q3, indicate whether the entire evaluation must be reaccomplished or just specific grading areas/subareas in this paragraph.
If the recheck evaluator of the knowledge recheck is different than the initial IE, the recheck evaluator signs and dates an appropriate statement under this paragraph.
Reviewing Officer's Remarks:
Final Approving Officer's Remarks:
Additional Reviews:

A2.5.9. Exceptionally Qualified Designation (Optional).

A2.5.9.1. An exceptionally qualified comment can be awarded when, in the judgment of the evaluator:

A2.5.9.1.1. The individual has demonstrated exceptional skill and knowledge in all phases of the evaluation; and exceeded all the evaluator's expectations of professionalism and subject matter competency.

A2.5.9.1.2. The member has not failed any requisite.

A2.5.9.2. Annotate the designation on the front of the AF Form 4350, first line of the Comments section, on a single line, in all capital letters ("EXCEPTIONALLY QUALIFIED").

A2.5.9.3. The designation can only be applied to the total evaluation - not to separate requisites.

A2.5.9.4. Lead command may determine additional guidance for the awarding of the EQ designation.

A2.6. - Certification.

A2.6.1. Evaluator.

A2.6.1.1. If two or more evaluators are required to complete an evaluation, the evaluator completing the evaluation signs Section III of the AF Form 4350.

A2.6.1.2. If more than one evaluator was involved in administering the evaluation, additional evaluator(s) enter any pertinent remarks in the Comments block of the AF Form 4350 describing those parts of the evaluation they evaluated and sign a signature block immediately adjacent their remarks.

A2.6.2. Reviewing and Final Approving Officer. The Reviewing Officer is the examinee's supervisor and the Final Approving Officer is the SIO.

A2.6.2.1. The Reviewing and Final Approving Officer ensures the recommended additional training is adequate to correct the noted deficiencies.

A2.6.2.2. If a Reviewing or Final Approving Officer does not agree with the overall rating, the overall grade is not changed. The Reviewing or Final Approving Officer marks the "Do Not Concur" block and provides comment in the Comments section.

A2.6.3. Examinee. The examinee is the last dated signature on the AF Form 4350.

A2.7. Knowledge and/or Task Rechecks. Document the task recheck on the original AF Form 4350 generated to document the Q-3 evaluation.

A2.7.1. Date Completed. Use the latest completion date (knowledge phase or successful task recheck) of the evaluation.

A2.7.2. Task Phase. Document the date of the task recheck on a separate line as “TASK RECHECK” below the evaluation entry under Task Phase.

A2.7.3. Qualification Level. Annotate the overall qualification grade as “3/1” in the qualified block.

A2.7.4. Expiration Date of Qualification. For evaluations that establish a new eligibility period, enter the month and year that is 24 months after the month in which the recheck was successfully completed. **Note:** Lead commands may be more restrictive.

A2.7.5. Restrictions. Place an “X” in the “Yes” block and list specific restrictions as the first item in the Comments block based on the original failed evaluation.

A2.7.6. Evaluator's Remarks: Recommended Additional Training. Document all recommended additional training associated with grading areas whose deficiencies will be remedied by a recheck.

A2.7.7. The evaluator that administered the evaluation signs the front of the AF Form 4350. If the recheck evaluator is different than the initial evaluator, the recheck evaluator signs and dates an appropriate statement in the Comments/Evaluator's Remarks.

A2.8. SIO-Directed Downgrade. The SIO may direct a downgrade to an intermediate level of qualification or unqualified status without administering an evaluation when such actions by the individual directly affect the SIO's confidence in the individual's ability to perform the unit's intelligence mission safely and to the level of proficiency commensurate with the individual's skill level. Do not use the directed downgrade as a substitution for, or in lieu of, administrative or judicial actions. The AF Form 4350 is prepared as follows:

A2.8.1. Section I. Complete Section I as directed above.

A2.8.2. Section II.

A2.8.2.1. Enter the qualification(s) to be downgraded (i.e., MSN and/ or specialized qualification) with the date of the situation that caused the downgrade in the Event/Check task phase block(s).

A2.8.2.2. Enter the qualification level (2 or 3) in the appropriate block.

A2.8.2.3. Enter the additional training due date, if required.

A2.8.2.4. In the comments section type "SIO-Directed Downgrade" followed by any restrictions, a detailed narrative of the situation causing the downgrade, related comments, any additional training requirements and/or actions necessary to regain qualification (e.g., full RQ evaluation or task recheck).

Table A2.2. Example Format for Comments SIO-Directed Downgrade.

A2.8.3. Section III. Only the SIO directing the downgrade and the individual concerned sign the AF Form 4350. The directing SIO signs in the final approving officer block and "X" the remarks block. Additional reviews are at the MAJCOM discretion.